How Do Japanese College Students Persuade in English? A Comparative Study of U.S.-Japan Winning Orations

by

Yoshihisa Itaba

A Paper Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Master of Arts
in English as a Second Language

July 12, 1994

1. Introduction

Many Japanese college students learn public speaking in their extracurricular activities in order to further improve their English as a foreign language. On almost every weekend, there is at least one English oratorical contest, either intercollegiate or "home-to-home," held somewhere in the country. The Japanese Ministry of Education has recently recognized its importance and, in its revised Course of Study, has ordered junior and senior high schools to offer English oral communication training through debate, discussion, and public speaking, starting in April 1995 (See the section "Oral Communication C." Ministry of Education 1994). Some universities, in response, have recently started to offer public speaking courses within their English language curricula (E.g., Kanda University of International Studies, in Chiba, Japan). The NHK television, the largest broadcasting system there, broadcasts, for the first time in the history of Japan's mass media, a program for English public speaking twice a week for three months (July-September) in 1994 (Nihon Hoso Kyokai 1994).

It may be interesting for those engaged in second language learning research and pedagogy, especially at a college level, to take a look at what Japanese EFL students have actually been doing in competitive speaking events in Japan. Do they adopt the norms of U.S. persuasive strategies in trying to be effective? If so, to what extent? What are

possible difficulties that they are likely to encounter in producing persuasive discourse in English? This study compared the characteristics of Japanese competitive college orations with those of American counterparts, in the hope that the findings would result in insight into effective pedagogy for better discourse training.

1.1 Goals

Bormann (1980) argues that communication transactions of a given community are usually guided by a community-specific communication theory which contains the following: "(1) rules of thumb as to how best to create artistic and effective communication transaction, (2) basic assumptions or values which guide the communication practices, and (3) descriptions of the exemplars of good communication for that community" (p.72). Thus, people in a community assume some ideal models of communication, be they explicitly spelled out or implicitly built-in, in order for the members to be able to interact effectively.

If ideal models of communication differ from culture to culture, or from one linguistic community to another, an important goal for second language learners is to acquaint themselves with those models and to go through appropriate training so that they can produce discourse as close to such models as possible. What researchers and educators must aim to do initially is to identify such ideal models, to describe

them, and to create an outline for appropriate pedagogical training.

1.2 Purposes and assumptions

This was not a study in contrastive rhetoric in the traditional sense that often compares two or more linguistic systems. It was a comparative study between Japanese and U.S. college orations presented in persuasive speaking events, all in the English language. This alone was its purpose. It specially compared the persuasive strategies employed by Japanese and U.S. college students. Strategies are here defined as "a plan of action, a maneuver designed to overcome the obstacles in a particular rhetorical situation. . . . Strategies are used to cope with controversial and complex issues, with hostile and skeptical audiences, and with difficulties in establishing [the speaker's] credibility and expertise as a source" (Campbell 1982, p.264). The study primarily aimed at finding strategic differences to further improve Japanese students' persuasive skills as they persuade in English, their target language (TL henceforth).

The present study assumed that second language learners must improve their discourse skills vis-à-vis the ideal TL discourse. The study did not regard as ideal the discourse that any given speaker of English produces. A U.S.-born Japanese scholar Akio Sawada (1983) observed that among native speakers of English, there are those who do not even

know how to read, let alone how to produce coherent discourse and that being merely a native speaker does not receive a free-pass to be regarded as the producer of an ideal discourse (p.8). This study assumed that second language learners should try to approximate their discourses to only those that were evaluated as excellent by the standards of the TL's discourse community. The "model," as defined in the present study, is what English-speaking academicians consider as ideal.

1.3 Focus

This study viewed the kind of English discourse composed and presented by Japanese students as their interlanguage (IL henceforth), which is perhaps best summarized by Tarone (1994) as "the separate linguistic system evidenced when adult second language learners attempt to express meaning in a language they are in the process of learning. This linguistic system encompasses not just phonology, morphology, and syntax, but also the lexical, pragmatic, and discourse levels of the interlanguage" (p.1716; For a fullest account of interlanguage, see Selinker 1972, 1992; Tarone 1988). Importantly, this view regards linguistic transfer from native language norms as only one of the elements that shape interlanguage. The other elements include, for example, transfer of training and strategies of communication, which the present study assumed to be equally important.

Accordingly, this study analyzed the English discourse in its own right and did not examine any persuasive discourse composed in Japanese; its sole focus was on what they did in their IL and on how it differed from what U.S. college orators did in their native language (NL hereafter) in a similar competitive speaking situation. For how well language is used rhetorically must be evaluated within the target culture's assumptions, their TL's standards. Ommagio (1986) was explicit: "Good writing in any language involves knowledge of the conventions of written discourse in that culture" (p.224). Her argument may, of course, be expanded to orations (prepared speeches) because they were, after all, pieces of persuasion that the students had written for oral presentation.

1.4 Perspective

The perspective that this study employed was neo-Aristotelianism, a speaker-oriented perspective, which expects the speaker to observe "in any given case the available means of persuasion" (Aristotle, 1355^{b}). Accordingly, "rhetoric" is here narrowly defined as a piecemeal product: an oration or a piece of writing composed of sentences that has a beginning and an end, organized in a recommended style, to be delivered to whomever might be vulnerable to its immediate influence. In short, the approach was "speaker-orientation" (Brock, et al 1990, p.28).

The speaker-centered perspective, although often criticized in the field of speech communication (e.g. Black 1965), was here justified on the solely pedagogical ground;[1] i.e., the present study was not intended to elucidate how Japanese symbol systems work among the Japanese in general, but its intent was solely to provide students and teachers alike with some insights into how their immediate audience adaptation skills in English as speakers might be improved.

1.5 Preview

In what follows, this essay (1) presents a survey of the relevant literature to provide justifications for this study and to generate research questions; (2) clarifies the methodology to be employed to answer those research questions; (3) delineates the ideal model for academic English persuasive speaking in order to set forth some standards by which Japanese students' speeches in English may be evaluated; and (4) provides pedagogical implications and suggestions based on the findings.

2. Literature review & research questions

2.1 Literature review

This study identified two types of works that are most relevant to Japanese persuasive patterns as compared to some English-language conventions: (1) studies on Japanese rhetorical styles and (2) works that were intended to give

practical advice to Japanese students learning English through oratory in Japan.

2.1.1 On Japanese rhetorical characteristics

Studies under this category attempted to elucidate how Japanese persuade from two approaches. One was an approach employed by applied linguists who studied contrastive rhetoric. The other was a group of studies by intercultural communication scholars who studied either Japanese psychology pertaining to persuasion or the specific cases in which the Japanese international persuasive acts were evaluated in terms of immediate effects.

Contrastive rhetoric. Traditionally, a contrastive analysis compared two languages in order "to identify points of similarity and difference between particular native languages (NLs) and target languages (TLs), believing that a more effective pedagogy would result when these were taken into consideration" (Larsen-Freeman & Long 1991, p.52). Likewise, English-Japanese contrastive studies focused either on Japanese conversation styles for linguistic scrutiny or on how the Japanese organizational pattern, ki-shō-ten-ketsu,[2] would function in discourse (Hinds 1977, 1978, 1980, 1983a, 1983b, 1983c, 1987). Those studies referred to the discourse as rhetorical in the sense of stylistics.

However, none examined how Japanese communicators symbolically persuade in a situation that necessarily called

discursive utterances into existence; i.e., because those previous studies removed Japanese discourse from the context in which it exerted its force, they failed to identify the problem of how the speaker would decrease the gap between the ideal discourse structure in a given situation that involved audience expectations and the actual discourse they would produce. Put simply, the perspective of audience adaptation and other constraints as a strategic response to a given situation was lacking.

The study by Hinds (1983a) here serves as illustrating this tendency. In this study, Hinds examined whether the ki-shō-ten-ketsu pattern was as clear to the American audience as it was to the Japanese. For analysis, Hinds used some of the tensei jingo [Vox Populi, Vox Dei] essays for the small (1.78 x 9.25 in) column, printed in the Japanese daily newspaper Asahi Shimbun, and its English translations in the Asahi Evening News, to be evaluated by Japanese and U.S. respondents respectively. Hinds concluded that the Americans, who had read the tensei jingo essays in English, found the essays less clear in terms of unity, focus, and coherence than the Japanese counterparts, who had read the same essays in Japanese.

Most pertinent to the present study, among others,[3] were the following problems inherent in Hinds's approach: First, it did not prove that the tensei jingo essays really employed this supposedly "vague" pattern of ki-shō-ten-ketsu whereas

Hinds asserted that it did. Akio Sawada (1977) argued, on the contrary, that there are very few Japanese composition textbooks which encourage the use of the ki-shō-ten-ketsu pattern, the pattern being basically suited for poetry writing in general and for classical Chinese poetry (kanshi) in particular (p.104).

Second, the tensei jingo discourse was not what Japanese EFL students produced but what journalists did. Thus, it did not follow that this was approximately what Japanese learners of English would actually do rhetorically in Japanese.

Third, the Hinds study was based on the a priori assumption that what the students do in Japanese most likely transfer into the English discourse which the same persons would produce, but this linkage was not shown at all in his study.

Finally, the concept of "rhetorical situations" was totally absent from Hinds's research design. Bitzer (1968) argued that a rhetorical situation, consisting of exigency, audience, and constraints,[4] must be analyzed in a rhetorical study, because it is a situation that calls rhetorical discourse into existence. This implies that if the situation (the nature of audience/judges, etc.) expects a particular discursive style as opposed to others to be employed, the stylist may possibly follow that style if he or she perceives that to be "expected."

Japan-U.S. cross-cultural studies. Although studies in

this category abound, a relatively limited number of works fall into the area that may be termed as Japanese persuasion studies. Overall, there are two major groups of studies. The first group of scholars (e.g., Nakane 1970; Nishiyama 1971; Doi 1973; Barnlund 1975) assumed (or admitted) a priori that Japanese are not as assertive as Westerners verbally and investigated why this was so, from situational, sociological, and psychological perspectives. The second group of cross-cultural communication scholars (e.g., Kume 1984; Dei 1990; Sakuragi 1992) evaluated the effects of some Japanese speakers who attempted to adapt to non-Japanese audiences, that is, their intercultural skills in immediate audience adaptation. These cross-cultural studies, though themselves insightful, mostly examined the speeches delivered in Japanese whose messages were conveyed through interpreters in English and thus did not tell us about how Japanese EFL learners would use language when they really need to persuade others in their English in response to a rhetorical situation containing some educated native or near-native speakers of English who are in a position to evaluate the art of persuasion.

In sum, the proposed study is justified on the ground that it took these problems into account. First, the present study did not hold any a priori assumption that particular organizational patterns or stylistic strategies would be employed by Japanese college students in the process of

learning to persuade in the IL. The approach was practice-centered and inductive. Second, the study examined the pieces of rhetoric which Japanese EFL students actually produced. Third, the study analyzed the English discourse produced by the Japanese students in its own right. Finally, the materials analyzed in this study were those tied with a rhetorical situation; the orations presented in a competitive situation that sought to produce the winner (exigency); the speeches addressed to a specific group of native or near-native speakers of English (forensic judges) under their immediate influence (audience); and the oratorical strategies employed according to what the orators had perceived to be judges' expectations, including time-limitations (constraints).

2.1.2 College persuasive speaking in Japan

The public speaking textbooks written for Japanese students generally paid more attention to speeches by U.S. social leaders as good examples than to those by U.S. college students who won the national speech tournaments. In the 1960s and 1970s, several introductory books on English speech-making were published in Japan. These focused on the so-called "English and delivery" aspects of public speaking and discussed the "spirits" towards effective public persuasion. Those elements included such attitudinal concepts as "self-confidence," "personal wisdom," or

"sincerity" (Uematsu 1960, 1966, 1969, and 1972; Matsumoto, T. 1966).

These textbooks usually contained one or both of the following types of speeches as good models: (1) winning speeches by Japanese students who won national English oratorical contests; and/or (2) public addresses delivered by famous social leaders in the English-speaking Western nations, particularly in the United States. The past U.S. Presidents (often John F. Kennedy) and Martin Luther King, Jr. often served as such examples. The English speeches of the first type were those by non-U.S. college students. The speeches of the second type were by those who had already gained a certain amount of social credibility (or ethos in Aristotle's terms) by the time they spoke. The speeches of the second type were also those delivered in response to certain social and political (thus non-pedagogical) requirements, such as anti-racism. In short, no winning speeches delivered by U.S. college students on educational occasions yet served as models during those decades.

The same can be said of the 1980s, except that this decade saw an attempt at introducing the so-called "Monroe's Motivated Sequence" model for speakers to use for audience analysis and adaptation (Hayase 1882; Matsumoto, S. 1984). Yet the publications during this decade assumed no model based on winning college orations in the United States.

Consequently, the present study suspected that if

Japanese college students had been influenced by the trend described above, then there might be some recurrences across their speeches, which may be different, in degree or kind, from the winning speeches by U.S. college champions.

2.2 Research questions

In partial response to the problems stemming from the relevant literature review above, the present study sought to answer two research questions for inductive/descriptive analysis:

RQ 1. What persuasive strategies are recommended to be employed in the U.S. community of college persuasion? How are these recommendations reflected within the actual orations that have been evaluated as excellent in the U.S. national speech tournaments?

RQ 2. What persuasive strategies are employed in the Japanese oratorical community of college EFL learners who won the national championships? And in what respects are they similar to and different from the U.S. counterparts in persuasive strategies?

The most important reason for asking these "questions" rather than establishing a set of "hypotheses" was that this was such a new project in the field of language learning that no prior model could be assumed initially and that the study had to start from scratch; the study required a guidance that would allow for a descriptive approach to discourse.

3. Methodology

3.1 Materials examined

The research questions spelled out above required that the following two types of sources be examined: (1) speech textbooks with prescriptions that may guide the U.S. college oratorical community as well as the actual orations evaluated as excellent. (2) English speeches produced by Japanese counterparts learning English.

In response to the first research question, this study examined (a) some public speaking textbooks used in speech classes in U.S. colleges, and (b) 10 winning orations printed in Championship Debates and Speeches (C.D.S., henceforth), published by American Forensic Association, i.e., the speeches that won the national championships in college persuasive speaking events. The speeches were those that had each been delivered before 5 judges within the 10-minute time-limitation. These speeches were all in the persuasive speaking genre that were made available to the author; there was no sampling procedure, accordingly.

In response to the second research question, this study examined 32 winning English orations by Japanese college students, printed in Gathering of Winners of Major Speech Contests (G.W.S., henceforth), published by the English Speaking Society of Meiji Gakuin University. In selecting the 32 sample speeches to be compared with the U.S. counterparts, the speech texts were chosen from the G.W.S. booklets published in the corresponding years to those of the

C.D.S. publications. Consequently, this study focused on the U.S. and Japanese winning speeches printed during the five-year period of 1986-1990. Also, the G.W.S. speeches that were made by high school students or business people were excluded from the sample of college oratory. These speeches were delivered before 5 judges and their time limitations ranged from 7 to 8 minutes. Judges for English oratory in Japan consisted of native or near-native speakers of English, often engaged in higher education in the country.[5]

3.2 Procedures: the genre approach as a qualitative method

Three steps were taken in order to examine the materials descriptively. First, in delineating an ideal model for the U.S. oratorical community, similar theoretical suggestions were identified as the shared prescriptions designed to guide U.S. orators in choosing particular rhetorical strategies. In the process of so doing, some arguments or rationales that supported a suggested model were also identified and spelled out because these were thought of as helping to understand the underlying values in favor of that particular way of persuasion.

Second, in trying to discover what the characteristics of American and Japanese competitive orations might be and the extent to which they put into practice the elements of good theory of English-language persuasion, this study began from a perspective that allows classification of similar

strategies into common genre. Simons (1978) defines "genre" as "recurring patterns of rhetorical practice" (p.36). Campbell & Jameison (1990) argue that "in the discourses that form a genre, similar substantive and stylistic strategies are used to encompass situations perceived as similar by the responding rhetors. A genre is a group of acts unified by a constellation of forms that recurs in each of its members" (p.335).

Accordingly, the recurrent patterns in persuasive strategies adopted by the U.S. college winners were first described, followed by the descriptions of the identified patterns in strategies employed by the Japanese orators who persuaded in English. In this process, the study attempted to illustrate each point it made by quoting liberally from the winning orations, basically in the chronological order unless need required to turn to a specific discourse.

Finally, the strategies were compared between the two nationality groups, and then cross-national similarities and differences were isolated by the author, presently engaged in rhetorical criticism, who had also acted as coach/judge in persuasive speaking activities both in Japan and the United States. After the classification of strategies, the qualitative characteristics of those similar and different strategies were spelled out. For the sake of face validity, this process had involved a collaboration with a research assistant, also with the experience in coaching and judging

English-language forensics both in Japan and the United States.[6] Additionally, a numerical comparison was made, whenever possible, in order to visualize the similarities and differences more clearly.

4. Analysis and results

4.1 Theory and practice in the United States

The first research question organizes discussion of analysis concerning prescriptions (theory) of persuasion in the United States and the orations (practice) that U.S. college orators actually presented.

RQ 1. What persuasive strategies are recommended to be employed in the U.S. community of college persuasion? How are these recommendations reflected in the actual orations that have been evaluated as excellent in the U.S. national speech tournaments?

4.1.1 In theory

This study identified three major strategies that were recommended to be employed. A first strategy is to emphasize logos (the quality of expert materials), instead of ethos (the credibility of the speaker's knowledge or experience). To begin with, Ehninger and his associates (1982) clarified an important preliminary strategic decision for an orator to make--whether to make his or her oration ethos-centered or logos-centered.

> Generally, a speech is primarily person-centered or primarily material-centered. That is, it can feature

> the personality, talents, experience, and wisdom of the speaker as its central engines of persuasion, or it can feature facts, figures, other sorts of evidence . . . Indeed, . . . rhetoricians have wondered whether the strategically conscious speaker should stress self (ethos in Greek) or material (logos).
>
> Of course, a speaker always is mixing the two . . . Yet one or the other often dominates sections of speeches or even entire discourses (pp.228-229).

Many public speaking textbooks mentioned this strategic choice and emphasized, indeed, the logos-centered approach to speech-writing. Although they normally admitted personal experiences to be one type of supporting materials, they often treated the speaker's own experience and wisdom merely as what he/she could use at the initial stage of the research (e.g., Galvin, et al 1988). The tendency appears to have resulted from the belief that supporting one's claims with the speaker's experience alone might not produce authoritativeness in argument. Blankenship (1972), for instance, wrote: "Authority is support drawn from the experience and judgment of someone other than the speaker" (p.152).

Another persuasive strategy is the general structure of the speech. Almost all speech textbooks recommended that speeches follow the general outline of introduction, thesis statement, body, and conclusion. For example, Minnick (1957) suggested that "modern speech texts contain a discussion of the introduction (proem), the thesis sentence (statement), the body (argument) and the conclusion (epilogue)" (p.261), and this emphasis still dominates contemporary speech

textbooks (e.g., Galvin, et al 1988).

A last strategy that the native speaker of English may employ is the choice of an appropriate organizational pattern to structure the discrete parts of the speech. Most of the speech textbooks provided some possible patterns of organization to choose from, but all never excluded the so-called "problem-solution" order (e.g., Ehninger et al 1982; Galvin, et al 1988). The usefulness of the problem-solution order, indeed, was most commonly emphasized. Galvin and her colleagues were explicit: "You can use many different organization forms in a persuasive speech. The most commonly used form is problem-solution method" (p.294). This order seems to have been specially highlighted because it could also be well integrated into extrinsically determined orders, such as Monroe's psychological sequence, which follows (1) Attention Step, (2) Need Step, (3) Satisfaction Step, (4) Visualization Step, and (5) Action Step; the second step would fit into the problem section of the speech while the subsequent steps would correspond to the solution section (see Ehninger et al 1982, p.166).

Theoretically, therefore, an ideal persuasive speech is one that is rational (material-centered) with the introduction, thesis statement, body, and conclusion in their general structure, parts of which are organized in the problem-solution order in adaptational response to the audience's psychological sequence in decoding messages.

These theoretical suggestions were found to be reflected in one forensic judge/scholar's article as follows:

> The structure of the speech should include a readily identifiable introduction, body, and conclusion. A memorable introduction should be followed by a thesis statement and an organizational preview. The speaker should explicate the problem in sufficient detail to create a need for the solution. . . . Many forms of evidence from a wide variety of sources should be integrated into the reasoning of the speech and be appropriately documented. The speech should continually focus toward the action goal which the speaker wishes to actuate. . . . (Olson 1989, p.435).

Olson's view, indeed, concurs with what has been observed (though not systematically) by others engaged in college oratory in the United States. Logue (1981) felt that "the credibility mode [e.g. personal involvement] appears to be undemanded by forensic judges, and likewise, generally not addressed by persuasive speakers. . . . [E]xpert evidence appears to be expected" (p.389). Reynolds (1983) wrote that "as a norm, the credibility facet in intercollegiate oratory appears as either a secondary concern of forensic judges, or of little concern to the orator" (p.126). Thus, all these "appear" to have happened in the United States. And in response, this study examined what <u>actually</u> happened.

4.1.2 In practice

How were these elements, either prescribed or intuitively observed, actually reflected within the U.S. winning oratorical texts themselves? What follows is a generic analysis of the oratorical texts in terms of

material-orientation, general discursive structure, and organizational pattern.

(1) Material vs. person. This study found that the U.S. speeches were far more material-centered (logos) than person-centered (ethos); there was found to be only one U.S. speaker who used her personal experience, but it was limited to the opening paragraph only. The ten winning orations this study examined all employed the material-centered approach to discourse. For example, in speaking against the U.S. sanctions on South Africa, a U.S. speaker, Kim Fageroos, turned to eight different sources (Table 1) in addition to other numerical information, whereas no personal experience was presented. One of Fageroos's judges, Bill Wallace, praised Fageroos's speech by writing in his post-presentation critique: "Nearly every sentence is related in some way to evidence in support or her position" (C.D.S. 1986, p.134). The same pattern was also identified in all the other orations; the number of sources the U.S. speaker turned to ranged from 8 to 18, the average number being 12.2 (Table 1).

(2) General outline. This study found that all the U.S. orations adopted the general sequence of outline as previously suggested above by Olson (1989): introduction (including thesis statement), organizational preview, body, and conclusion. For example, a U.S. champion, Hrien-Saitong, presented the opening paragraph of her oratory with the story of an alcoholic secretary working at Systems Control and

stealing highly secret documents from the U.S. Army, the proem which one of her judges, Robin Goldstein, evaluated as "a well-chosen anecdotal introduction" (C.D.S. 1986, p.164). Next, the speaker moved to her central thesis: "Ironically, as spying has become more prevalent, we have become numb to the growing weakness in our national security system," and then presented an organizational preview as follows: "So, . . . let's take a look at how America's sinking security system is endangering us. What exactly causing the leaks? And finally, how we plug the holes in our leaky ship of state" (C.D.S. 1986, p.162). This was then followed by the body, which was evaluated by the same judge as "well-evidenced with well-chosen statistics" (p.164). The speech was concluded with a set of solutions, followed by a memorable epilogue by going back to the introductory story of that alcoholic secretary.

(3) Organizing the discrete parts of speech. A last finding of this analysis related to how the discrete parts of the speech might be organized. All the U.S. college champions conformed to the problem-solution organizational norm in constructing arguments. This conformity also became clear when special attention was paid to the content of their organizational previews, which unanimously proceeded from what problem(s) the speaker would articulate with the analysis of their cause(s), to what solution(s) should be implemented to eliminate the problem(s). For example, Stolts

stated in his speech preview: "In order to understand and combat childhood obesity we must first realize how widespread and dangerous the problem is. Then we will examine why more children are becoming obese. Finally, we will determine what we as parents, future parents, educators and citizens must do to ensure that future generations do not grow up obese" (C.D.S. 1987, p.122). One of his judges, Sheryl A. Friedly, later wrote in her critique that his speech "provides us with a clear organizational pattern for his problem-solution development" (C.D.S. 1987, p.125). Thus, the problem-solution order was the organizational pattern used by all the U.S. college speakers.

Another notable recurrence is that all the U.S. speakers presented their own analysis of the causes of the problems (See Table 2). This strategy, which discusses the cause(s) of the problem(s) articulated, was the pattern which Minnick (1957) viewed as also a variation of the problem-solution order (pp.263-264).

In addition, the study found that in the solution section of each oration, the focus was on the action goals which the orators wished to realize. That is, in presenting a set of solutions to the articulated problem, every U.S. speaker asked his or her audience to do something specific as agents of change. For example, after Jan Moreland articulated the seriousness of the problem of chlordane poisoning, she asked her audience "to call an exterminator

before he comes to your home and ask him if he uses chlordane . . . If the exterminator tells you he uses chlordane, tell him you will not patronize his services . . ." (C.D.S. 1987, p.152), among other specific suggestions for action.

What is equally noteworthy was one particular type of message that recurred in the solution sections of their speeches: This study found that in every solution section there was a request that the audience encourage administrators or legislators to do something in support of the speaker's position. For example, Shelley Schnathorst suggested: "It is this bill, HR 2595, which you should encourage your legislators to support" (C.D.S. 1988, p.114). Audience actuation in presenting solutions, therefore, appears to have been another important strategy adopted by the U.S. champions.

In practice, therefore, forensic judges and students alike conformed to the prescriptions and expectations for ideal oratory; the winning orations were outlined as prescribed and were well-evidenced mostly with information from sources other than the speakers themselves and with clear articulation of problems and their corresponding solutions. In addition, part of the purpose for presenting the solutions was to "actuate" their audiences, that is, to motivate them to do something specific to make change happen.

4.2 Japanese speakers in English oratory: a comparison

How did the Japanese learners attempted to persuade in English, as compared to U.S. champions in oratory. The discussion that follows is guided by the second research question:

RQ 2. What persuasive strategies are employed in the Japanese oratorical community of college EFL learners who won the national championships? And in what respects are they similar to and different from the U.S. counterparts in persuasive strategies?

The present study found that there were some noteworthy recurrences in rhetorical strategies across the English orations delivered by the Japanese winners with respect to the three strategic elements: material vs. person, general outline, and organizing the discrete parts of speech.

(1) Material vs. person. The Japanese speakers stressed "self" (ethos), that is, their speeches demonstrated a heavy use of their own experience and wisdom to support claims. They did not turn to a variety of sources other than the speakers themselves, unlike the U.S. winners in persuasion. Numerically, the Japanese student, on the average, turned to as few as 1.4 sources compared to the U.S. counterpart who relied on 12.2 different sources (See Table 2 in Appendix). Instead of basing their arguments on a variety of sources, the Japanese speakers approached discourse by showing their personal experiences and wisdom.

More specifically, Shimizu, for example, talked about Japanese ignorance of other peoples and cultures by relying only on two sources other than the speaker himself: comments

from "a young Turkish diplomat" to Japan (G.W.S. 1986, p.18) and from "some young South African blacks" (p.19). All the other supporting materials were drawn from his personal experience with his acquaintance from the Philippines and from his own wisdom. In criticizing unproductive Japanese group communication based on their hierarchy-oriented mentality, Kurachi (G.W.S. 1986) used but one supporting material from a Japanese sociologist, whereas her most other examples came from her own experience in communicating with her colleagues in the extracurricular activities for English, as well as from her own wisdom. Likewise, in discussing the danger of the so-called "appointment and catch sales" in Japan, Kondō (G.W.S. 1986) adopted the person-centered strategy, having turned to two sources other than the speaker herself. The central engine of Kondō's oration was her personal experience of working part-time as a sales clerk. It was her own eye-witness observations that revealed how tricky the sales people were in this type of business in Japan.

The only exceptions to this were the oratory delivered by Miyamoto, who used her personal anecdote only in the opening paragraph (G.W.S. 1989), and the speech made by Ō)sawa, who relied on 5 different sources (though still much less than the U.S. orators) (G.W.S. 1990).[7]

For a closer look at this difference, the following paragraphes composed by a U.S. student and by a Japanese are

illustrative. First, examine the "well-evidenced" paragraph in which the U.S. speaker, Dempsey, developed her argument that the problem of lead poisoning was getting worse:

> Probably what's even worse is the fact that the EPA is not even enforcing their current standards. According to that same issue of Sierra, as of January first, an amendment to the Safe Drinking Water Act required in-state bans on the use of materials containing lead. But this ban is neither retroactive nor sufficiently enforceable. So not only does the ban effectively preclude all those buildings or structures built before 1988, Ellen Silvergale [Chief Toxic Scientist for the Environmental Defense Fund] explains, inexpensive lead solder will still be available, that could be used on our drinking water pipes despite the ban (C.D.S. 1988, p.145).

Dempsey's paragraph was thus supported by two pieces of expert evidence. Compare this with the following paragraphs written by Ōno, who articulated the problem of Japanese workaholism as follows:

> Japanese workers seem like robots. Their absentee hours total only 34 hours per year, 100 hours less than that of other countries. Even though the system provides holidays, most people take fewer than the leisure days offered. Japanese simply do not take rest time.
>
> As a child, when I spent too much time playing, my parents scolded me saying, "Don't waste your time! Go to your desk! Study hard!" Many of you probably have the same kind of recollections. I call this the "Ninomiya Kinjiro [a Japanese symbol of diligence] syndrome" (G.W.S. 1989, p.16).

This Japanese speaker based the first paragraph on his own wisdom (non-expert evidence), as partly implied by the vague reference to "other countries"; an expert would have made a more accurate presentation of data. The second paragraph was filled with his personal experience he had as a child,

together with his own wisdom of the culture-specific analogy ("Ninomiya Kinjiro"), which the speaker assumed would be shared by his Japanese audience.

Thus, the U.S. champions emphasized the quality and quantity of expert evidence (logos) whereas the Japanese orators turned to the speaker's experience (ethos), in order to produce persuasiveness in oratory

(2) General outline. A second strategy that this study identified as recurrent with the Japanese learners was that, like the U.S. college champions, they also outlined their speeches along the sequence of the introduction, body, and conclusion (See Table 2 in Appendix).

For instance, in her post-script column of the G.W.S. transcript, Hirano clearly explained that she had followed the "Introduction-Body-Conclusion" pattern (G.W.S. 1987, p.15). Saeki, too, adopted the same pattern for outlining, and (a) presented in the introduction the court cases in which the constitutionality of government screening of history textbooks was examined, with his central contention that, while the government justified the [Japanese wartime] brutality as inevitable, it was "far from inevitable" (G.W.S. 1987, p.16), (b) developed in the body his argument that the Japanese should not be indifferent to their past, and (c) warned in the conclusion that if the Japanese remain a nation blind to the past, they "will be blind to the future as well" (G.W.S. 1987, p.17). Similarly, Itō supplied the

introduction with basic numerical information about the so-called "discriminated villagers" in Japan, the body with the descriptions of how badly they were still discriminated against and of what ought to be done, and the conclusion with an appeal to emotions by defining the discrimination as a Japanese version of "apartheid" (G.W.S. 1987, p.19).

The study discovered, however, that the Japanese college orators unanimously skipped the "organizational preview" step, unlike the U.S. counterparts (See Table 2). A part of Takahashi's oration (about anti-Japanese sentiments of non-Japanese Asians) here serves as an example illustrating this trend. At the end of the introduction, the speaker cast two key questions: "Why do they [non-Japanese Asian students she met] have such a negative feeling toward Japan? Are we doing something wrong to them?" (G.W.S. 1988, p.12). Then, the speaker moved quickly to the main body, (filled with personal anecdotes,) which began: "Since then, I started to read books on Asian countries and talk to Asian friends to answer these questions. And I found their negative feelings toward Japan are baced [sic] on the following ideas of Japan . . ." (G.W.S. 1988, p.12). The arguments unfolded until she came to the conclusion; an organizational preview did not find its place anywhere in the discourse.

This phenomenon was observed in all the 32 speeches written by the Japanese students herein examined. That is, whereas the U.S. speakers added a clear organizational

preview immediately before the main body of the speech unfolded, none of the Japanese orators adopted this strategy.

(3) Organizing the discrete parts of speech. The present analysis found that all the Japanese winners employed the problem-solution order, like all the U.S. counterparts. However, the study also found that there were two major variations within this organizational feature. One was that 9 out of 32 Japanese students implemented the orthodox problem-solution pattern of articulating the seriousness of the problems and then directly suggesting how to solve them (See Table 3).

For example, Yamada first described Japanese attitudes toward the physically challenged people and then provided his audience with two attitudinal solutions: to treat the physically challenged with "love" (G.W.S. 1988, p.14) and to do something not "for" but "with" them (G.W.S. 1988, p.15).

The other strategic variation was to spend some paragraphs in discussing the cause(s) of the problem(s). Like the U.S. winning orations, this "cause" section was located between the sections for problems and solutions. (The "cause" section could of course be seen as part of the problem section.) This study found that there were 23 Japanese speakers who discussed the cause(s) of the problem(s). For instance, after Ikemoto depicted the typical Japanese who do not take opposing views in communicating interculturally, she presented a pair of paragraphs which

began: "Why do we easily accept outside criticism without explaining ourselves?" The first paragraph discussed a lack of self-knowledge on the part of the Japanese while the second pointed out the Japanese tendency to avoid confrontation (G.W.S. 1988, pp.20-21). These paragraphs were followed by her suggestions. This variation (problem-cause-solution) was the strategic choice also made by all the U.S. orators.

Interestingly, concerning this second variation, Nagata made a noteworthy comment in his G.W.S. column as follows: ". . . we DON'T HAVE TO mention everything: problem, cause, harm, solution, (concrete suggestion), etc. . . . In this speech I tried to talk a lot about the cause area without paying attention to the so-called 'pattern of speech.' So I dared to leave out concrete suggestions!" (G.W.S. 1986, p.31). This implies that a persuasive speech can merely be a discourse to convince as opposed to a discourse to "actuate," for it to be good enough.

Nagata's retrospective remarks also led to another noteworthy finding in terms of the use of their problem-solution strategy. That is, unlike the U.S. winning speeches, most solution sections in the Japanese students' speeches did not go so far as to urge their audiences to take action through the use of "concrete suggestions." Their solutions were mostly suggestions intended only to change beliefs, attitudes, or values. Although there were 9

Japanese speakers that clearly asked the auditors to take action, those action plans were all on the personal level (See Table 3). Although there were 4 speakers[8] who exhorted their audiences to influence the agents of change such as governments or corporations to support their positions, the rest (28) of them did not adopt this strategy.

For instance, Kakegawa talked about Japanese selfishness and indifference to other Asians, and when he arrived at his point "Change is necessary RIGHT NOW!", he had already been within the very last minute of his given time, which was fed with a solution(?): "Then how? I know this is such a big and difficult problem. I am not about to tell you a phony solution. There is only one solution, that is we change, opening our eyes to the problem. Only when enough people are aware of this problem can we start to do something about it" (G.W.S. 1988, p.23).

In summary, the present study revealed that the Japanese national champions in college oratory employed the person-centered strategy to produce persuasiveness (turning to only 1.4 sources for evidence on the average). This analysis also revealed that these champions outlined their discourses along the introduction-body-conclusion sequence, without an organizational preview, and adopted the problem-solution method. There were found to be variations in emphasis and focus, while the solution sections were often personal and did not involve public solving agencies to make change

happen.

In what follows, these similar and different elements in college oratory in English are examined vis-à-vis EFL/ESL pedagogy.

5. Discussions

5.1 Theoretical implications

As ESL/EFL teachers engaged in inter-linguistic and inter-cultural education, it is important not only to be aware of the differences but also of why those differences arise. Based on this recognition, three implications are discussed in what follows. First, the study showed that the Japanese winners composed discourse in the ethos-centered fashion (person), which Ehninger and his coauthors viewed as one of the two strategic choices. The U.S. counterparts, by contrast, approached persuasive discourse in the logos-centered manner (material), given the expectations of the U.S. forensics judges.

This strategic choice that the Japanese orators made implies that they in fact wanted to be involved in discourse personally and that personal involvement as a choice was thought to be effective to make their pieces more unique than their competitors' orations. Thus, Saeki retrospectively justified his experience-centered speech by arguing: "I inserted my experience in America. . . . we need to show in our speech why we talk about it and why not others. We can

do it either by taking a unique approach to the topic or personal examples" (G.W.S. 1987, p.17). Likewise, Kondō wrote: "While I was writing this speech, what guided me the most was 'motive': why do I want to speak on this particular topic? My motive was a sense of responsibility to reveal what I actually witnessed and heard and to let the terrible facts be known to many people" (G.W.S. 1986, p.25). But as seen earlier, this is "undemanded" by U.S. judges (Logue 1981; Reynolds 1983).

A second implication is that the Japanese college champions adapted well to the English-language discursive norms in outlining, namely the introduction, body, and conclusion. The Japanese ki-sho-ten-ketsu pattern, as proclaimed by Hinds to be their major rhetorical style, was not adopted by those Japanese speakers as the means to organize their English persuasive discourse for competitive speaking events. Put differently, the rhetorical situation, which involved native or near-native English speaking judges, invited the adoption of what they perceived to be an appropriate organizational pattern in the TL. This may be interpreted as the learner's conscious effort to internalize aspects of the TL (For insight into this type of learning strategy, see, for example, Cohen 1990).

Although this could, in a way, be thought of as a kind of native language transfer as the Japanese are also familiar with their own discursive style equivalent to introduction,

body, and conclusion: jo-ron, hon-ron, and ketsu-ron, or jo-hon-ketsu in short (Noji 1968, p.116; Kanda 1980, p.28), the possibility of transfer from training seems greater, because their training process consciously encourages them to use this discursive style, as seen, for example, in "Spee-Centric," a manual (Spring and Summer 1985) written for the Japanese learners of English oratory by the Speech Advisory Commission of the Kanto Universities E.S.S. League (KUEL), of which the author was a member. Senior members of many English speech programs (extracurricular activities) tell the new-comers daily to employ this particular style for English persuasion. Therefore, the adoption of this discursive style by the Japanese should rather be seen more as a kind of transfer from training than from a Japanese discursive norm. Put differently, it is possible, for Japanese college students, as it was for the learners examined, to employ this style when and if they strongly think of it as demanded by their evaluators such as judges.

The absence of a preview statement from the English orations delivered by the Japanese could be understood from the fact that an organizational preview is itself a new technical concept yet to be known to people involved in the intercollegiate English oratorical community in Japan. (None of the materials on English oratory for the Japanese the author examined did not discuss this strategy.) Thus, this may also be considered a kind of transfer from training;

i.e., they did not include in their orations the preview statements because they were not told to do so.

A pedagogically important question here would be why this concept has not come into notice. An important value that supports the use of an organizational preview is the notion that the speaker should take the responsibility to guide where they bring their listeners, and this is why a preview statement is sometimes called "a road map" in the forensic community in the United States. As Hinds (1987) noticed, there seems to be a gap in speaker-listener (writer-reader) responsibility between Japanese and English speakers. (The English word "speakers" itself suggests the focus more on speech than on perception. The author intuitively submits that the Japanese would ask a non-Japanese "Do you understand Japanese? (wakari-masu-ka)" more often than "Do you speak Japanese? (hanashi-masu-ka)," suggesting that the Japanese listener may have greater responsibility in communication transaction than the English counterpart.)

A last implication is that although the Japanese students were probably familiar with and actually adopted the general style for outlining, what they actually did within the "body" entertained our attention. In developing their arguments, the Japanese college orators used the variations of the problem-solution order. However, in dealing with solutions, most of the Japanese avoided to motivate the audiences to act as "public selves" or, if they did, they at

best attempted to change beliefs and attitudes or to increase the audience awareness of the problems. There were a few speakers who did provide some provocative solutions, but those were suggestions far from political but private.

Why? Perhaps this tendency has something to do with the difficulty, on the part of the Japanese, even to think about or come up with concrete solutions. The difficulty was even frustrating to some Japanese students. Nakayama, while having been told by her judges to present a concrete solution to the problem, confessed in her retrospective comments that the task was "not so easy, . . . because I myself have not been able to find a concrete solution to the problem, yet (G.W.S. 1989, p.19)." Furthermore, not only did she find it hard to invent solutions, but she even resisted to conform to such requirement, as she continued: "But does a speech have to have a solution to be recognized as a proper speech? I tried to justify my speech by saying that it was intended to make audience become aware of the problem . . . although we must not forget the fact that sooner or later we have to find a concrete solution (G.W.S. 1989, p.19)." However, it is revealing that this speaker was one of the few who did ask the audience to take action (though not as clearly as the U.S speakers did), implying her internal conflict between the TL's and NL's conventions. A few other Japanese expressed views similar to Nakayama's comments.

Judges of oratory in the United States clearly demanded

a set of solutions that could be adopted by the audiences and by their governmental agents. Moreover, the judges in the U.S. oratorical tournaments appear to be going in the direction to ask for even more clearly pictured solutions. Zizik, who judged Heffernan's oration, wrote on her ballot the following words: "[Heffernan's] speech did provide some provocative solutions: installing a low-flow plumbing device and alternative land applications for sewerage. I was puzzled because I could not understand how a low-flowing plumbing device placed in a toilet could combat the problem. Perhaps it could save water, but to aid to better disposal . . . quite a blurry one" (C.D.S. 1989, p.85). After Fort spoke of the problem of "Sick Building Syndrome," his judge, Jensen, demanded in retrospect on his ballot with the following feedback: "How can we influence your suggested federal legislation? This solution is certainly a logical one, but needs to be more clearly related to your audience members as agents of in[f]luence" (C.D.S. 1989, p.127). It is not surprising, therefore, that U.S. students, receiving this type of comments from their judges, attempt to present clear and workable solutions.

Most important of all, however, is that these differences seem to be rooted at a much deeper level than stated above, the level of cultural differences in communication and world view between Japan and the United States in higher education. Most notably, some cross-

cultural studies (Mushakoji 1972; Condon 1984; Sakuragi 1992) described Japanese communicative norms as the awase (adaptation-oriented) approach, wherein one not only tries to adapt to the other's position but assumes the other will do the same. The U.S. communication, by contrast, was described by those studies as erabi (choice-oriented). Awase represents the Japanese attitude to communication whereas erabi is characteristic of how the Americans prevail upon one another.

According to this view, the awase culture of the Japanese "recognizes the unavoidable gap between form (language) and reality" (Sakuragi 1992, p.108), and this feeling may be expressed as, "We say things should be this way, but we know that in practice it is not so simple" (Condon 1984, p.49). Because awase is a logic of seeking to apprehend and adapt to the environment, this "view also implies that one cannot proceed toward a fixed goal, but rather must adjust to changing situations" (Sakuragi 1992, p.107). On the other hand, the erabi culture "reflects the view that, ideally, human beings can manipulate their environment freely for their own purposes. In this view, a person sets his or her objective, develops a plan to accomplish the objective, then acts according to the plan" (Sakuragi 1992, p.107).

A society that highly vales awase not only generates such world view but also the so-called "behavior setting"

(See Barker 1960, 1968) in which communicative behavior to change or influence "others" (instead of "us/me") may be kept to a minimum. From this perspective, Tsujimura (1987) argues that "Americans have many chances to enlarge themselves and express themselves to the outer world. . . . In a society like Japan, people naturally learn to maintain a passive attitude toward society and leave everything to others" (p.120). The Japanese learners were given a setting (speaking events) in which they could express themselves. But because the broader cultural "behavior setting" in which they grew up was such that the content of their persuasive message may have remained very Japanese. Or it may also be because the "behavior setting" was not that of ESL but of EFL, where most of their listeners were speakers of Japanese, that they adopted the awase approach to persuasive discourse.

The value for awase may explain why the Japanese students approached public discourse based on their own experience and did not (or could not?) present solutions for public actuation. This value assumes that reality, which involves "others," is not the main object of change; i.e., the problem is not the external reality (social environment or changing situations). The problem is "we," who are not adapting to the reality appropriately. The cause of the problem thus comes from within "us," which includes "me." And the person "I" has recognized this gap, the gap between reality and "our/my" problematic attitudes, which are still

not satisfactory given the reality's need. Therefore, when the speaker's consciousness about this gap was raised, the person "I" in discourse had to be viewed as one of "us" who recognized this gap by "wondering," "being surprised," or "realizing," i.e., personal feelings which in turn had to be expressed within that discourse. Examine the following paragraph in which Iwasaki, one of the speakers, was surprised:

> Also, other typical Japanese food like Tofu, Konnyaku, and noodle are in the similar situation. Though I knew that the amount of food importation is large, still, I was so surprised that even such typical Japanese food can not be produced in our countr[y] (G.W.S. 1990, p.14).

Consider another one composed by Nakai:

> A college student [from Korea] said to me, "Before I met you, I had a prejudice against Japanese. But now, I want to know more about Japanese, and to be good friends." I realized that even if it's impossible to atone for our guilt, their attitude will be more generous and the relationships between us will surely improve by our own effort (G.W.S. 1990, p.21).

In the first excerpt, the speaker criticized "our" indifference, and in the second, the speaker's attitude happened to improve her relationship with her Korean friend, implying that this is the direction in which "we" should go. Thus, these two speakers, like the most other Japanese examined in this study, argued that it is "we" (and therefore "I") who need to change, given the reality that "I" perceived. Personal involvement in discourse was important and necessary for the Japanese orators because without "I"

first changing "myself," how could the speaker have responsibly persuaded "us" to change "ourselves"?

The contrast is startling with respect to the U.S. erabi strategy, which assumes that "we" are doing nothing wrong; it is "they" who are doing something wrong to "us" and therefore "we" (speaker and judge/audience) have to stand up and act wisely to make change happen. In the U.S. orations examined, it was "they" that were viewed as necessary to be changed. "We" ought to change "their" attitudes and policies, to defend "our" rights and lives. None of the U.S. orations, therefore, attributed the cause of the problem to "our" attitudes except for the argument that "we" have not taken action, with awareness and knowledge, to get "them" to solve the problem. The U.S. orations all assumed that the pivotal causes of the problems were external in general.

For this reason, the Japanese public discourse in English may be regarded as "the oratory of self-examination," while the U.S. equivalent may be phrased "the oratory of other-examination" or "the oratory of objectivity." The issue relevant to ESL/EFL learners and educators is the need to shift from the self-examination strategy to the other-examination composition approach (objectivity-orientation) to persuasive discourse. This seems especially true when an EFL/ESL class is designed to help its students to get ready for attending academic classes at an undergraduate or graduate level in the United States, where instructors often

seem to demand non-personal works based on sources other than the students themselves (term papers, theses, and the like).

5.2 Pedagogical implications

Because this study examined the stages of invention and disposition (though not of memory and delivery), the suggestions that follow may be useful not only for speech training but for English writing pedagogy as well. (Notice the fact that in the U.S. discourse community, written papers are presented orally sometimes in class and usually at conventions and that the speeches examined in this study were, after all, what they had written to be memorized for oral presentation.) It must be noted that the following suggestions are not the ones that work under all conditions; they will be of some use only if ESL/EFL educators and learners agree that learning to adapt to the TL's norms is an important goal.

The discursive model which the U.S. college winners faithfully put into practice is what Bormann (1980, 1990) refers to as a "style-specific special communication theory." According to this view, for this theory to function, ESL/EFL learners and teachers must, first of all, agree with the philosophical rationale that supports that model. Then the teachers may proceed to observe the practice (i.e., real discourse produced) and give them the rule-of-thumb advice. The teacher must evaluate the discourse in terms of how close

it is to the ideal model. The special theory for composing persuasive discourse modeled on the U.S. winning college oratory is described as follows, vis-à-vis pedagogical suggestions:

(I) Philosophical rationale

The teacher must assume the following rationale. Good persuasive discourse for academic training is the discourse that is clear and material-centered, supported mostly by evidence from sources other than the speaker (writer). (The use of public speaking for academic training in the United States is discussed in Ballinger & Brand 1987.) A good persuasive act, if for the purpose of cross-cultural training, views the audience (readership) as significantly influenced by the problem rather than as producing the problem, hence encouraging topics of societal concern. The underlying philosophy here is that a pedagogically sound speech act assumes the audience as the good citizenry on a regional, national, or international level, who therefore are expected to act as such in order to solve the social problem. Put differently, a good piece of persuasion for the pedagogical purpose of English-language composition analyzes the external causes of the problem (outside the audience) rather than the attitudes of "ourselves" revealed as a result of self-examination.

It is assumed that EFL/ESL learners will benefit from

discourse training supported by this rationale, because (a) the rationale encourages Japanese learners to use the U.S. erabi strategy, i.e., an approach to analyze and spell out the social environment in and of itself (apart from the learners themselves) rather than how to adjust their own attitudes to the changing circumstances; and (b) the rationale encourages the learners to recognize the importance of clarity (including the greater responsibility of the speaker/writer) through general outlining (including preview statements) and organizing the discrete parts of the discourse.

(II) Ideal model

(A) Invention (theme-creating) stage. An ideal theme is one that is not merely of personal importance but of importance to many others. Accordingly, ESL/EFL teachers should encourage their students to find a topic that does not merely interest them personally but that is also of societal concern. For example, the teachers may encourage the learners to avoid examining "our" attitudes and, instead, to identify some problems in the surrounding circumstances "out there" rather than within their audience themselves.

(B) Disposition (arrangement) stage. Teachers should encourage their students to outline their speeches in the

following style, hence evaluate them accordingly:

> Introduction: (1) Attention-getter. Does the introduction contain a story not only relevant to the topic but attractive to the audience? (2) Central thesis statement or key question(s). Does the teacher (as his audience) understand the central theme or question(s) the student aims at answering?
>
> Organizational preview (This could be treated as part of the introduction): Does the student provide a clear step-by-step preview that spells out the major components of the discourse? As his or her listener (reader), is it a helpful "road map" that shows clearly where the student is planning to go?
>
> Body: (1) Problem(s). Does the student define the problem(s) clearly? Does the student describe the seriousness (scope) of the problem(s)? Does the student analyze the external cause(s) of the problem(s)? Does the student argue that the problem(s) can be eliminated, curtailed, or controlled?
>
> (2) Solution(s). Does the student present a set of solutions that will work to solve the problem(s)? Does the student explain the process in which those solutions help solve or mitigate the problem(s) Does the student tell the audience what to do as members of the community? Does the student set forth the plan of action that the audience may take on personal and public levels?
>
> Conclusion: (1) Summary. Does the student provide a clear summary of his or her whole argument vis-à-vis the central thesis statement? (2) Ending. Does the student present clear, relevant, and memorable ending remarks?

(C) Elocution (diction, grammar, and aesthetics) stage.

This area was not focused on in the present study. But some following suggestions may be of some use. The teacher should see if the student's choice of words is appropriate, whether the sentences are grammatically accurate, and whether the statements are aesthetically effective by asking, for

example, Is there a better way of saying the same thing?

(D) Memory and delivery. This last stage, being strictly the area of oral communication, was also excluded from the analysis of the study. However, the following questions, among others, may be asked to help picture an ideal model: Is the presentation smooth, or casual without being too formal? Does the student use pauses appropriately? Is the student's eye contact natural and effective? Is the student's voice projection large enough? Etc.

(III) Practical advice

When the teacher needs to justify a particular piece of practical advice given to the student, the explanation may well be given on the basis of the philosophical rationale delineated above.

The teacher should especially encourage the student to seek external causes of the problem, as opposed to blaming his or her audience including the student him/herself. Accordingly, the teacher's feedback on the student's discourse should mention the extent to which he or she analyzed external causes of the problem articulated.

In addition, in order to improve the student's skills to compose "material-centered" discourse, it may be a good idea to make a guideline, such as the number of different sources

that the student must turn to as supporting materials. The student may be informed in advance that this number is a necessary (if not sufficient) condition to receive an "A" grade on the presentation (composition). To the author's knowledge, many instructors in U.S. speech classes require that the student rely on 7 to 10 different sources in order to develop the main argument and to support his or her position.

5.3 Suggestions for future research

Any study has its focus and thus limitations; this study was no exception. First, this study did not purport to examine how to improve the student's skills on the phonological, morphological, syntactical, lexical, and paragraph levels. It only focused on the invention and arrangement of discourse.

Second, this study was limited to the analysis of college persuasive discourse and, therefore, did not investigate how to improve the student's discourse skills to describe or to inform things or concepts accurately, although the process of creating a persuasive discourse often involves the act of accurately describing what happened, is happening, and will happen.

Third, public actuation in the solution section (action step) may appear extremely difficult to ESL students in particular, because they are usually not the citizens of the

United States; they may not feel entitled to ask their audience to influence the agents of social change and policy-making such as Congress as the U.S. champions did. But at least they can do library and field research to think about and present what policies should be implemented or sound most reasonable. Also, in relation to this limitation, the present study did not investigate or set forth any teaching plan to improve the student's research skills for creating persuasive discourse.

Finally, the theoretical formulation of the ideal model described above is not general but special to the community. It is not something (like laws of nature) that works regardless of whether the student likes it or not. The theory works when and if the teacher and the student collaboratively agree with all or part of the theory designed to explain why producing discourse like the model is important.

In addition, even if the student agrees, it then will require a lot of time and effort. The nature of the U.S. ideal model is such that the learners will have to do research in search of supporting materials. The EFL winners this study examined above were all hard-working students, unlike typical Japanese college students. Many of the winners spent the whole summer in composing their speeches. On the other hand, some ESL students from Japan, whom the author happened to teach in an ESL program here, were

learning English not for the purpose of academic preparation but for "a kind of vacance" or "playing hookey from nerve-racking life in Japan." The theory does not work to those students unless their purposes of learning English change in the direction favorable to this study's original intention. Therefore, the teacher's careful observation is recommended; the teacher might apply the theory (fully or partly) only to those who appear willing to spend time and energy to improve persuasive discourse skills in English and to benefit from that effort.

NOTES

[1] The speaker-orientation perspective of neo-Aristotelianism has been criticized as an approach to understand human persuasion in general. For one thing, public speaking is only one of the available formats to convey a message, while decisions are often made not merely because of public speaking's inherent efficacy but because of many other efforts and factors, such as those through an individual's reading, person-to-person or small group interaction, etc. Moreover, public speeches often "occur" out of given social, situational, or even historical requirements; without considering such requirements, as a typical criticism goes, one would not understand human symbolic influence in general.

However, the author believes that this speaker-centered assumption is what is necessary for the purposes of producing academically successful non-native speakers of English, because what they need is to adapt themselves to their immediate audiences of the TL with immediate effects generated from the quality of their term papers or oral presentations, as long as they are learning English in college-level programs.

[2] The meanings of the elements in the ki-shō-ten-ketsu organizational pattern are as follows: "(A) ki ( ): First, begin one's argument. (B) shō ( ): Next, develop that. (C) ten ( ): At the point where this development is finished, turn the idea to a sub-theme where there is a connection, but

not a directly connected association [to the major theme]. (D) ketsu ( ): Last, bring all of this together and reach a conclusion" (Hinds, 1987: p.150).

[3] One of the objections is what Hinds himself is aware of: the quality of translations. The nuances in Japanese are sometimes not identically conveyed in a syntactically faithful translation in English. (pp.192-194) Second, it has not checked the reliability and validity of the scale at all. For example, Hinds has asked neither the U.S. respondents to read and evaluate English short essays of similar length, originally designed for target American readership, nor the Japanese respondents to do the same in their Japanese translations. Would the Japanese respondents also find clear and coherent those essays written about U.S. culture and for U.S. readership? Finally, but related to the previous objection, Hinds failed to consider the functional and cultural aspects of discourse in Hinds's choice of tensei jingo as the material. An important function of discourse is to communicate to a culturally and linguistically specific audience. The tensei jingo essay is a piece of rhetoric communicated to those who live in Japan. It assumes that the readers also participate in the discourse and that it may contain expressions which only those readers who know the Japanese language and culture could comprehend. Such expressions may be, to use Bormann's (1985) terms, "inside cues" (p.6) or, in Bitzer's (1959) words, "the enthymeme, . . . whose function is rhetorical persuasion. Its successful construction is accomplished through the joint efforts of speaker and audience" (p.408). Of the enthymematic and culture-bound aspects of tensei jingo, Ito (1986), one of its former translators, rightly says in a conversation with his discussants including the author: "I used to translate tensei jingo for the Asahi Evening News. It is a kind of discourse in which its authors often . . . truncate the middle of a logical sequence or assign implied meanings. . . . I guess that Westerners, unless specialists of Japan studies, do not understand it" (p.7). A rhetorical discourse does not exist apart from specific cultural context in which it occurs; however, these considerations are absent from Hinds's approach.

[4] Bitzer (1968) defines these three constituents as follows: An exigency "is an imperfection marked by urgency." Because rhetorical discourse "produces change by influencing the decision and action of persons," a rhetorical audience "consists only of those persons who are capable of being influenced by discourse and of being mediators of change." Every rhetorical situation "contains a st of constraints made up of persons, events, objectives, and relations . . .

Standard sources of constraint include beliefs, attitudes, documents, facts, traditions, images, interests, motives, and the like" (pp.7-8).

[5] Those who often judged English oratorical contents in Japan during this 5-year period were educated native speakers of English or those who studied speech communication in the United States. For example, such educators as Frederick Harris (Professor Emeritus, Oregon State University, Lecturer at Waseda University), Richard Spear (Professor, Tokyo Woman's Christian Junior College), Catherine Toyoshima (Instructor, Tokyo YMCA), Scott Howell (Associate Professor, Sophia University), to name but a few, served as judges at national contests.

[6] The author served as judge at various English oratorical contests in Japan (1986-1989), as speech coach to the English speaking societies of Tokyo Woman's Christian University (1985-1986) and Dokkyo University (1988-1989), as assistant director of forensics at the University of Minnesota (1990-1991), and as judge at regional and national speech tournaments in the Unites States (1990-1991). The author wishes to thank his research assistant, Satoru Aonuma (M.A. in Communication Studies, University of Iowa, 1989), who has served as forensic coach and judge in Japan and the United States (1986-present).

[7] The former student, Miyamoto, went to St. Dominic school from the first grade to the twelfth grade and, in her sophomore year in college, studied at Hope College in the United States although the author was not able to get information as to how many months she studied or which classes she attended at Hope. The latter speaker, Ōsawa, was personally coached by the author, who suggested that he should turn to a variety of credible sources. The author assumes that these factors may have influenced the exceptionality of those two orations.

[8] Two of these speakers, Nakayama and Nagano, were those whose orations had been commented by the author before they participated in the national contests. In the following year, these two students coached the other two exceptional speakers, Iwasaki and Oshima. (In passing, these four exceptional speakers were part of the same English speech team at Keio University.) It is suspected that the coaching process may have had bearing upon their exceptional approach to solutions. It also implies that the Japanese students usually do not ask their listeners to take public action but that, <u>if coached</u>, they can do so.

Table 1: Material vs. Person

Speaker	Nationality	Sources	
		Number	Average
Kim K. Fageroos	U.S.A.	8	
Kay Hrien-Saitong	U.S.A.	17	
Michael Stolts	U.S.A.	12	
Jan Moreland	U.S.A.	12	*U.S.A.:*
Shelley Schnathorst	U.S.A.	8	
Brenda Dempsey	U.S.A.	13	*12.1*
Betsy Heffernan	U.S.A.	11	
William Fort	U.S.A.	10	
Amy Olson	U.S.A.	13	
Stephanie Kaplan	U.S.A.	18	
Tappei Shimizu	Japan	2	
Kaoru Kurachi	Japan	1	
Takako Kondo	Japan	2	
Takashi Onishi	Japan	4	
Hiroyuki Nagata	Japan	1	
Ken Takehisa	Japan	3	
Megumi Hirano	Japan	2	
Yoshitaka Saeki	Japan	4	
Makoto Ito	Japan	0	
Akiko Yoshida	Japan	0	
Koji Fukuzawa	Japan	0	
Mitsuru Honma	Japan	1	
Noriko Takahashi	Japan	0	
Yoshihiro Yamada	Japan	0	
Mamiko Nishimura	Japan	4	*Japan:*
Shohei Sakazaki	Japan	4	
Mika Ikemoto	Japan	1	*1.4*
Akihito Kakegawa	Japan	1	
Keiko Mototaka	Japan	0	
Chikako Miyamoto	Japan	2	
Koji Ono	Japan	1	
Kaoru Nakayama	Japan	0	
Azumi Kuroiwa	Japan	0	
Michiya Fujii	Japan	2	
Kazuaki Uekawa	Japan	0	
Chikara Nagano	Japan	0	
Yuji Osawa	Japan	5	
Maki Saito	Japan	1	
Maki Iwasaki	Japan	1	
Ayumu Oshima	Japan	0	
Yuki Ihara	Japan	0	
Yuko Nakai	Japan	3	

Table 2: General Outline

Speaker	Nationality	General Outline	
		Introduction Body Conclusion	Preview
Kim K. Fageroos	U.S.A.	*	*
Kay Hrien-Saitong	U.S.A.	*	*
Michael Stolts	U.S.A.	*	*
Jan Moreland	U.S.A.	*	*
Shelley Schnathorst	U.S.A.	*	*
Brenda Dempsey	U.S.A.	*	*
Betsy Heffernan	U.S.A.	*	*
William Fort	U.S.A.	*	*
Amy Olson	U.S.A.	*	*
Stephanie Kaplan	U.S.A.	*	*
Tappei Shimizu	Japan	*	
Kaoru Kurachi	Japan	*	
Takako Kondo	Japan	*	
Takashi Onishi	Japan	*	
Hiroyuki Nagata	Japan	*	
Ken Takehisa	Japan	*	
Megumi Hirano	Japan	*	
Yoshitaka Saeki	Japan	*	
Makoto Ito	Japan	*	
Akiko Yoshida	Japan	*	
Koji Fukuzawa	Japan	*	
Mitsuru Honma	Japan	*	
Noriko Takahashi	Japan	*	
Yoshihiro Yamada	Japan	*	
Mamiko Nishimura	Japan	*	
Shohei Sakazaki	Japan	*	
Mika Ikemoto	Japan	*	
Akihito Kakegawa	Japan	*	
Keiko Mototaka	Japan	*	
Chikako Miyamoto	Japan	*	
Koji Ono	Japan	*	
Kaoru Nakayama	Japan	*	
Azumi Kuroiwa	Japan	*	
Michiya Fujii	Japan	*	
Kazuaki Uekawa	Japan	*	
Chikara Nagano	Japan	*	
Yuji Osawa	Japan	*	
Maki Saito	Japan	*	
Maki Iwasaki	Japan	*	
Ayumu Oshima	Japan	*	
Yuki Ihara	Japan	*	
Yuko Nakai	Japan	*	

Table 3: Organizing the Discrete Parts of Speech

Speaker	Nationality	Organizational Pattern		Solutions to the Problem(s) Articulated†		
		Problem-Solution	Cause Analysis	Attitude or belief change	Action on a personal level	Action on a public level
Kim K. Fageroos	U.S.A.	*	*	*	*	*
Kay Hrien-Saitong	U.S.A.	*	*	*	*	*
Michael Stolts	U.S.A.	*	*	*	*	*
Jan Moreland	U.S.A.	*	*	*	*	*
Shelley Schnathorst	U.S.A.	*	*	*	*	*
Brenda Dempsey	U.S.A.	*	*	*	*	*
Betsy Heffernan	U.S.A.	*	*	*	*	*
William Fort	U.S.A.	*	*	*	*	*
Amy Olson	U.S.A.	*	*	*	*	*
Stephanie Kaplan	U.S.A.	*	*	*	*	*
Tappei Shimizu	Japan	*	*	*		
Kaoru Kurachi	Japan	*	*	*	*	
Takako Kondo	Japan	*	*	*		
Takashi Onishi	Japan	*	*	*		
Hiroyuki Nagata	Japan	*	*	*	*	
Ken Takehisa	Japan	*		*		
Megumi Hirano	Japan	*	*	*		
Yoshitaka Saeki	Japan	*	*	*		
Makoto Ito	Japan	*		*		
Akiko Yoshida	Japan	*	*	*		
Koji Fukuzawa	Japan	*	*	*		
Mitsuru Honma	Japan	*	*	*		
Noriko Takahashi	Japan	*	*	*	*	
Yoshihiro Yamada	Japan	*		*		
Mamiko Nishimura	Japan	*	*	*	*	
Shobei Sakazaki	Japan	*		*	*	
Mika Ikemoto	Japan	*	*	*		
Akihito Kakegawa	Japan	*		*		
Keiko Mototaka	Japan	*	*	*		
Chikako Miyamoto	Japan	*	*	*		
Koji Ono	Japan	*	*	*	*	
Kaoru Nakayama	Japan	*		*		*
Azumi Kuroiwa	Japan	*	*	*		
Michiya Fujii	Japan	*	*	*		
Kazuaki Uekawa	Japan	*	*	*	*	
Chikara Nagano	Japan	*		*	*	*
Yuji Osawa	Japan	*	*	*		
Maki Saito	Japan	*	*	*		
Maki Iwasaki	Japan	*		*	*	*
Ayumu Oshima	Japan	*		*		*
Yuki Ihara	Japan	*	*	*		
Yuko Nakai	Japan	*	*	*		

† (a) "Attitude or belief change": the speaker asks the audience to change (reinforce) beliefs, attitudes, or values. (b) "Personal actuation": the speaker tells the audience what to do personally to improve or protect themselves. (c) "Public actuation": the speaker asks the audience to act to influence the solving agents outside the audience to make change happen.

References

I. General sources

Ballinger, B. J. & Brand, J. D. (1987). Persuasive speaking: a review to enhance educational experience. The National Forensic Journal, 5: 49-54.

Barker, R. (1960). Ecology and motivation. In Jones, M. ed., Nebraska symposium on motivation. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Barker, R. (1969). Ecological psychology. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Barnlund, D. C. (1975). Public self and private self in Japan and the United States. Tokyo: Simul Press.

Bitzer, L. F. (1959). Aristotle's enthymeme revisited. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 45: 399-408.

Bitzer, L. F. (1968). The rhetorical situation. Philosophy and Rhetoric, 1: 1-14.

Black, E. (1965). Rhetorical criticism: a study in method. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Blankenship, J. (1972). Public speaking: a rhetorical perspective. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bormann, E. G. (1980). Communication theory. Salem, WI: Sheffield Publishing Co.

Bormann, E. G. (1985). The force of fantasy: restoring the American dream, Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois Univ. Press.

Bormann, E. G. (1990). Small group communication: theory and practice. New York: Harper and Row.

Brock, B. L., Scott, R. L., & Chesebro, J. W. (1989). Methods of rhetorical criticism: a twentieth-century perspective. Third ed. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

Campbell, K. K. (1982). The rhetorical act. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co.

Campbell, K. K., & Jameison, K. H. (1979). Introduction to Form and Genre. Form and genre: shaping rhetorical action. Campbell, K. K., & Jameison, K. H., eds. Falls Church, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Cohen, A. D. (1990). Language learning: insights for learners, teachers, and researchers. New York: Newbury House.

Ehninger, D., Gronbeck, B.E., McKerrow, R.E., & Monroe, A.H. (1986). Principles and types of speech communication, tenth ed. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Co.

Galvin, K.M., Cooper, P.J., & Gordon, J.M. (1988). The basics of speech: learning to be a competent communicator. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Hinds, J. (1977). Paragraph structure and pronominalization.

Papers in linguistics, 10: 77-99.
Hinds, J. (1978). Anaphora in Japanese conversation. In Anaphora in discourse, Hinds, J., ed., Edmonton, Alberta, Can.: Linguistic Research, Inc., 136-178.
Hinds, J. (1980). Japanese expository prose. Papers in Linguistics, 13: 117-158.
Hinds, J. (1983a). Contrastive rhetoric: Japanese and English. Text, 3: 183-195.
Hinds, J. (1983b). Organizational patterns in discourse. In Givon, T., ed., Syntax and semantics, 12: Discourse and syntax, New York: Academic Press, 135-157.
Hinds, J. (1983c). Linguistic and written discourse in particular languages. Contrastive studies: English and Japanese. In Kaplan, R. B., Jones, R. L., & Tucker, G. R., eds., Annual review of applied linguistics, Vol.3, Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 78-84.
Hinds, J. (1987). Reader versus writer responsibility: a new typology. In Writing across languages: analysis of L2 text, Connor, U., & Kaplan, R. B., eds., Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 141-152.
Ito, K., Matsumoto, S., Okada, N., Inomata, M., & Itaba, Y. (1985). Nihonjin no eigo-gakushu-ho wa machigatte iru [The Japanese method of learning English is wrong!]. In Gekkan hon'yakujin (Translator), Tokyo: Babel Press.
Kanda, N. (1980). Shoronbun sakubun no giho [Techniques for writing theses and papers]. Tokyo: Seibunsha.
Kaplan, R. B. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in inter-cultural education. In Language Learning, 16: 1-20.
Kume, T. (1984). A comparative analysis of the invitational speeches at Baden-Baden by Nagoya and Seoul for the 1988 International Olympics--a case study in international persuasion--. In JALT Journal, 6, Tokyo: 35-69.
Larsen-Freeman, D., & Long, M. H. (1991). An introduction to second language acquisition research. New York: Longman.
Logue, B. (1981). In what ways is argument applied in the prepared speech events? Dimenstions of argument: proceedings of the second summer conference on argumentation. Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.
Matsumoto, S. (1984). Eiken ikkyu supich [Speech for English step test 1]. Tokyo: Eikyo.
Matsumoto, T. (1964). Eigo enzetsu (Public speaking: its principles and practice). Tokyo: Eiyusha.
Ministry of Education (1994). Shin gakushu shido yoryo: eigoka [New Course of Study: English Courses]. Tokyo: Ministry of Education.
Minnick, W. C. (1957). The art of persuasion. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Nakane, C. (1970). Japanese society. Los Angeles, CA: Univ. of California Press.

Nihon Hoso Kyokai (July 1994). San kagetsu eikaiwa: Yasashii supichi [3-month English conversation: easy speech-making]. Tokyo: Nihon hoso kyokai shuppan.

Nishiyama, K. (1971). Interpersonal persuasion in a vertical society--the case of Japan. Speech Monographs, 38: 148-154.

Noji, J. (1968). Ronbun no bunsho [Discourse in theses]. Kokubungaku: kaishaku to kansho. The Novermber special edition, "Handbook for discourse writing." 114-123.

Olson, C. D. (1989). The development of evaluation criteria for individual events. In Sphere of argument: proceedings of the sixth SCA/AFA conference on argument. Gronbeck, BE. ed. VA: Speech Communication Association, 434-439.

Purves, A. C. ed. (1988). Writing across languages and cultures: issues in contrastive rhetoric, Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Reynolds, C. L. (1983). 'Winning' orations? A study of select interstate oratorical speeches. National Forensic Journal, 1: 119-135.

Sakuragi, T. (1992). Doi Takako: a Japanese player of the western game of dialogue--Doi's speech of September 17, 1987. In The Howard Journal of Communication, : 105-117.

Sawada, A. (1977). Ronbun no kakikata [How to write theses]. Kodansha Gakujutsu bunko 153, Tokyo: Kodansha.

Sharon, D. (1990). Rhetorical strategies to bridge the cross-cultural gap: Nakasone at the Sorbonne. In Asian Thought and Society, 15 (October 1990): 255-267.

Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. International Review of Applied Linguistics, 10: 209-231.

Selinker, L. (1992). Rediscovering interlanguage. New York: Longman.

Speech Advisory Commission of the Kanto Universities E.S.S. League (Spring and Summer 1985). Spee-Centric. An unpublished manual for the spring and summer camps for learning English oratory.

Doi, T. (1973). The Japanese patterns of communication and the concept of amae. In Quarterly Journal of Speech, 59: 180-185.

Tarone, E. E. (1988). Variation in interlanguage. London: Edward Arnold.

Tarone, E. E. (1994). Interlanguage. Encyclopedia of language and linguistics. New York: Pergamon Press, 1715-1719.

Tsujimura, A. (1987). Some characteristics of the Japanese way of communication. In Kindaid, D. L. ed., Communication theory: eastern and western

perspectives. San Diego: Academic Press, 115-126.
Uematsu, T. (1960). Eigo benron no tebiki [A manual for English public speaking]. Tokyo: Kenkyusha.
Uematsu, T. (1966). Eigo no supichi [English speech]. Tokyo: Sogensha.
Uematsu, T. (1969). Eigo supichi jitsureishu [Examples of English speeches]. Tokyo: Sogensha.
Uematsu, T. (1972). Eigo supichi no shikata [How to make a speech in English]. Tokyo: Hyoronsha.

II. Sources for sample winning orations

Championship debates and speeches. Vol. 1-5 (1986-1990). American Forensic Association.
Gathering of winners of major speech contests. (1986-1990). English Speaking Society of Meiji Gakuin University.

Appendix:

The Winning Orations Examined in this Study